



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

aware of the limitations of the man as well as of his great excellencies. One, however, wonders whether Mr. Richman has ever carefully considered the question, What first prejudiced the magistrates and clergy of Massachusetts against Williams? Was it his attack on the patent or his defense of toleration? Upon this depends largely one's view of the justice of their conduct toward him.

Had Mr. Richman attempted a comparison between Rhode Island and the other New England colonies, he might have exhibited some of its characteristics in a light even clearer than that which appears in his pages. The lack of territorial unity in that colony, as compared with Plymouth, Massachusetts, or Connecticut, would have appeared in bold relief. Its constant struggle to maintain its territorial integrity would then appear partly as a natural incident of its location. It might also be seen that it was the effort to preserve this integrity, to save themselves from being annexed by their enemies, which forced the jarring elements within Rhode Island into union. Under the first charter union was not compulsory; it was only permissible. Nothing could be clearer than the contrast between the relations in which the towns stood to the colony in Rhode Island and their position elsewhere in New England. It was reflected, as the author has shown, in the methods of legislation under the first charter. Rhode Island was a confederacy of towns and for a long time after its settlement secession was a possibility. The bearing of this on the Coddington episode the writer might possibly have made a little clearer.

But Mr. Richman has done his work well. His book is accurate and fair. His treatment approaches reasonably near to the standard of the present time and to the demands of the subject. He has wrought into his picture all the salient features of early Rhode Island development.

HERBERT L. OSGOOD.

*The History of Enfield, Connecticut, compiled from all the public records of the town known to exist, covering from the beginning to 1850.* Edited and published by FRANCIS OLCOTT ALLEN. (Lancaster, Pa.: Wickersham Printing Co. 1901. Three vols., pp. x, 1-912, index, lviii; 913-1904, index, cxxv; 1905-2653, index, lxxxix.)

THESE three handsome and massive volumes contain the entire documentary history of a Connecticut town. With these volumes at hand any one interested in local institutions could work out the development of town life in one particular community and could obtain a mass of evidence valuable not only for the study of local institutions as such, but also for the illustration of larger issues connected with the history of the state and the country.

Enfield owes this unique distinction of possessing her entire body of records in print to the devotion of a descendant of one of her leading families. Mr. Francis Olcott Allen, a retired business man of Philadelphia, desiring to raise a monument to the honor of the town of his

ancestors, has conceived this method of carrying out his purpose. He has certainly done a very unusual and noteworthy thing, for which every historical scholar will owe him thanks. Few will probably use the material here presented, but all will appreciate the example set. In devoting so large an amount of money to the preservation of historical records Mr. Allen has honored himself and the subject of history, as well as the town in whose interest he has planned this work. We can only wish that other men of wealth would follow his example and leave monuments not of stone but of volumes containing in print the perishable records of some particular locality. And furthermore we would wish that more of those who, like Mr. Allen, have a lively interest in some historical town or region would refrain, as he has done, from attempting to write that history themselves and would devote time and energy to the task of transcribing the old records and printing them without curtailment or abridgment.

Enfield was not one of the first group of Connecticut towns and therefore its career is not so important nor its evidence so valuable as would be the case had it been settled before 1660. It was settled from Springfield in 1683 and belongs to the third period in the history of the towns, when the circumstances attending the settlement had become more or less artificial. Worcester belongs in the same category. The basis of the plantation was not a religious and covenanted community, and the first settlers were not a church first and a land community afterwards. In Enfield the land community came first, lands were granted under conditions drawn up by a Springfield committee, and as it happened scarcely one of the original grantees actually settled on his grant. For ten years this committee governed the plantation, though in 1683 a constable had been chosen and a sort of civil organization erected. The next year the people organized themselves into a church and built a meeting-house, and finally in 1688 were incorporated as a town by the Massachusetts general court. Not, however, till 1693 did independent local government begin and were town-meetings regularly held.

In Enfield, as in Worcester at about the same time, the system of land distribution was more or less artificial in origin, but it conformed to the general plan prevailing throughout New England by providing for small, scattered allotments — home-lots, field-lands, and meadows — which distinguished the New England system so sharply from that of Pennsylvania, West New Jersey, Maryland, and Virginia. The committee controlled all land grants until 1692, and the "Committee Book" here printed is one of the most valuable parts of the work, from the social as well as from the agricultural point of view. From 1693 to 1711 a few grants were made and these by the town (pp. 131, 283, 285, 286, 289). But disorder and dissatisfaction led to the regaining of full control by the proprietors (pp. 315, 682), in Enfield always called, at first, commoners. A commoner was simply any one who possessed rights in the common and undivided lands of the town, and in giving to themselves a firmer organization during the years from 1711 to 1715 the commoners were

doing what a great many other commoners in Connecticut and Massachusetts were doing, rescuing their rights from the hands of those who, though inhabitants of the town, had no rights of property in the lands of the township. The Enfield records furnish one more proof of the fact that communal holding of land was unknown in New England. There were a few town lands (pp. 368, 396-7); there were lands which the town received from the colony, the sale of which it kept in its own hands (p. 344); there were other lands owned by the commoners, of which the town had the use for a certain number of years (p. 352); but there is not a trace of communal holding of land, in the usually accepted sense of the word, anywhere in these records. I doubt if it can be found in the records of any New England town. In the detail of their method of distribution and in the rights that they recognized the commoners of Enfield differ in no way from those of other New England towns. All the lands were finally distributed by the year 1734.

One of the most striking incidents in the history of Enfield, and one that gives its career a wider importance, relates to the "secession" of the town from Massachusetts and its union with Connecticut. Enfield lies to-day very near the northern boundary of Connecticut, yet for sixty-six years it was under the jurisdiction of Massachusetts. In 1702 Connecticut discovered that the old boundary line was wrong; and the Enfield people, apparently finding out that they lay within Connecticut's jurisdiction, voted "to yeld themselves under conettecott thir government" (p. 301). In 1710 Enfield was hopeful and voted to send one deputy to Boston but no more "except ym see good reason." But Connecticut was not ready to receive them, and for forty-five years the agitation continued. Connecticut was at this time involved in the effort to save her charter and in the struggle over the intestacy law and did not want to get into any trouble with Massachusetts such as to lead to an appeal to England. But Enfield was persistent: in 1740 she voted to join with Connecticut in order "to Injoy the Priviledges which of right belong to them." She sent one man to Hartford to see if Connecticut would "Except of us," others to the towns of Suffield, Woodstock, and Somers to persuade them to agitate also, and gave power of attorney to another to go about the colony for advice and to visit New Haven in order to influence the legislature. All these efforts show how badly Enfield wanted the municipal freedom guaranteed by Connecticut, and the greater civil liberties and independence from England that the Connecticut charter allowed. Finally, the intestacy question being settled and all danger of losing her charter being removed, Connecticut consented to receive the towns. Naturally, Massachusetts was angry, and had Connecticut accepted earlier the petition of the towns and had she attempted to draw them within her jurisdiction, she would certainly have got into trouble. Even as it was, Massachusetts refused to let the towns go and did not abandon her claim till 1804.

There are many other questions of interest to which attention might be called. Mr. Allen has printed the documents relating to the "Strict

Congregational Church of Enfield," one of which, a pamphlet, does not appear to have been known to the Reverend Dr. Means when he wrote his thesis in 1899 on this important phase of the "Great Awakening." There are indications here and there of the social and industrial activities of the people. In the town the majority of inhabitants were husbandmen, planters, yeomen, and laborers. There were also weavers, feltmongers, tanners, cordwainers, and shoemakers, carpenters, housewrights, and joiners, a dishturner, a ship-carpenter, a combmaker, a chairmaker, bloomers (iron-workers), coopers, and millers. There were no articles produced for export except turpentine; beef, pork, grain, and tobacco seem to have been leading staples for home consumption. These were current instead of money as late as 1770. All money was of course reckoned in pounds, shillings, and pence until 1796, when the word "dollars" appears, but the symbol \$ was not used until 1798. The first church bell appeared in 1784, the first town clock in 1791, seating the meeting-house continued till 1834. In 1811 lightning-rods were put on the church building. There were many deaths of "languishment," one of "hydrocephalus," many of "the rattles," and one of an "inscrutable disease in the head." The town officers were about the same as those of other towns, except the "key keeper," a term I conjecture to be the same as "pound-keeper."

Two quotations of more than local interest may well close this review. In 1770 the town sent an "agent, to attend at a General Meeting of Merchants and Landed Interests of this Colony with instructions to Consider Such Constitutional Measures as may be judged Proper for the removal of those Duties we Suffer from in Special Stedfastly to keep up the non Importation agreement and that the Violaters of it be Treated with Contempt particularly Shew Severest Resentment to the Conduct of New York" (p. 2516). On July 11, 1774, the town rose to the following height of eloquence:

"Then further taking into our Serious Consideration the present alarming situation of the British Colonies by an undue Exertion of ministerial and parliamentary power—which have a direct tendency to the destruction of the British Empire and if persisted in must Inevitably terminate in the utter subversion of our Constitution and total loss of american freedom. and While our hearts glow with the most filial duty and affection to our rightful sovereign king George the 3d and to his illustrious house, and we feel the warmest sentiments of Gratitude to those worthy Gentlemen whose noble and patriotick zeal has animated them with such Wisdom and firmnes to oppose the torent of oppression like a flood Rolling upon us we Cannot but Express our deepest Concern and Grief that men who are decended from the Natural and known Enemies to the Brunswick Succession and who inherit the Intrigue and malevolence as well as the honours and Estates of their ancestors should find such acces to the Royal Ear and by their Subtilty and disguise alienate his majesties affections from his dutiful and loyal subjects. and while we Consider that those who tamely submit to wear the shackles of slavery or behold with supine Indifference al that is dear to us and posterity wrested from us by force must be dead to the principle of self-preserva-

tion Callous to Every feeling of humanity and Criminally Regardless of the happiness and welfare of unborn millions, therefore, Resolved unanimously, that a firm and Inviolable union of the Colonies is absolutely necessary for the defence and support of our Civil Rights with out which all our Efforts Will be likely to prove abortive. that to facilitate such a union it is our Earnest desire that the Committees of the Several Governments meet in a General Convention at such place as shall be thought most Convenient as soon as the circumstance of distance and a Communication of Intelligence will possibly permit" (p. 445).

CHARLES M. ANDREWS.

*Social New York Under the Georges, 1714-1776.* By ESTHER SINGLETON. (New York : D. Appleton and Co. 1902. Pp. xix, 407.)

A happy, self-satisfied small town, where fashion was much considered, where the round of life rolled on comfortably and pleasantly, distances being short and social entertainment frequent, where there were nearly as good markets as in Philadelphia, almost as much education as in Boston, London modes a trifle late, and where wealth had nearly as great weight in fixing a standard as in Greater New York—such is the picture outlined in Miss Singleton's careful mosaic, put together with bits from ephemeral records. There is nothing haphazard in the author's selections. The morsels are chosen with judgment and discrimination, and so dovetailed that a fairly graphic whole is obtained. The work is painstaking and conscientious. Wills, inventories, private letters, and, above all, the advertising columns of newspapers have been called into requisition to furnish data as to manners, customs, and the methods of supplying their necessities. This kind of information gains value from its unconsciousness. It gives at least one phase of the truth as travelers give another. In connection with the latter, discrimination must be used to distinguish between real observations and those borrowed from an earlier commentator. As Owen Feltham's *Dutchman Epitomized* in the middle of the seventeenth century furnished a mine of epithets for many later tourists to Holland, note-book in hand, so here too, convenient and apt characterizations are sometimes found in use by the next comer. For instance, Kalm's description of New York in 1748 is evidently so much to the taste of some unnamed person who "spent a month in their metropolis, the most splendid town in North America," that he does not trouble to find new phrases. He is quoted as an "enthusiastic author" (p. 5).

The chapters on "Houses and Furniture" are enriched by illustrations showing many objects with pedigrees still treasured in various families. In this section it is to be noted how markedly the impress is English. The Dutch element had, apparently, almost disappeared.

In Part V., family portraits are most suggestive in the discussion of women's dress, and the advertisements, too, are brought into play and used with a good deal of skill. Evidently London fashions were in vogue here about four months after their first appearance in England.